



Arizona Substance Abuse Partnership
Meeting Minutes
June 26, 2008

Summary

Arizona Substance Abuse Partnership (ASAP) Members in Attendance (18):

Dennis Burke, Chair (Governor's Office)
Jean Ajamie (Department of Education)
Reuben Alonzo on behalf of Jane Irvine (Attorney General's Office)
Tom Betlach (AHCCCS)
Karen Bulkeley on behalf of Kenneth Deibert (Department of Economic Security)
Anthony Coulson (Drug Enforcement Administration)
Major Scott Hadley (National Guard)
Irene Jacobs (Governor's Office of Children, Youth and Families -Executive Director and Senior Policy Advisor)
Duce Minor (Parker Area Alliance for Community Empowerment, Inc.-PAACE)
Dr. Laura Nelson (Department of Health Services)
Dr. Kim O'Connor (Governor's Office/Division for Substance Abuse Policy)
Jerry Oliver (AZ Department of Liquor License and Control)
Dr. Dora Schriro (Department of Corrections)
Mary Specio-Boyer (COPE Behavioral Services, Inc.)
Dr. Kellie Warren (Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections)
Kathy Waters on behalf of Dave Byers (Administrative Office of the Courts)
Brian Wilcox on behalf of David Felix (Department of Public Safety)
Karen Ziegler (Arizona Criminal Justice Commission)

Arizona Substance Abuse Partnership (ASAP) Members Absent (7):

Suzie Barr (Ex-Officio, Governor's Office)
Scott Cocuzza (Business Leader)
Richard Fimbres (Governor's Office of Highway Safety)
Marnie Hodahkwen (Ex-Officio, Governor's Office)
Mary Joyce Pruden (Ex-Officio, SAMHSA/CSAP)
Jeff Sanders (Community Member)
Christopher Vasquez (Pinal County Sheriff)

Public (9):

David Choate (ASU)
Colleen Copple (SAI)
James Copple (SAI)
Kim Dalferes (SAI)
Gregory Gage (ASU/CPS)
David Gallagher (AATP)
John Pettingill (Touchstone)
Angie Rodgers (Governor's Senior Policy Advisor on Health and Human Services)
Phillip Stevenson (Arizona Criminal Justice Commission)

Linda Weinberg (Cenpatico)

Indiana Delegation (2):

Sonya Cleveland (Indiana Criminal Justice Institute)

T. Neil Moore (Indiana Criminal Justice Institute)

Call to Order

Mr. Dennis Burke called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm.

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Burke welcomed members and thanked them for their commitment and hard work. He welcomed the visiting representatives from Indiana, Mr. T. Neil Moore and Ms. Sonya Cleveland and introduced them to the group. ASAP members introduced themselves around the table.

Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Burke asked members to review the minutes from the previous meeting. Dr. Nelson motioned to approve the minutes as written, and Mr. Coulson seconded the motion. There were no objections and minutes approved as written.

Substance Abuse Policy Perspective from Indiana

Mr. Burke noted that Mr. Copple would be introducing the representatives from Indiana to provide an overview of their state's substance abuse policy perspective and coordinating structure.

Mr. Copple mentioned that Arizona has been chosen to participate in the Eight State Meth Initiative through a Community Oriented Policing (COPS) grant designed to build capacity through technical assistance. Mr. Copple discussed the similarities between Arizona and Indiana and discussed how the structure and purpose of ASAP is in line with a Boston College study on a state substance abuse model, calling attention to strategic priority areas.

Ms. Colleen Copple discussed Indiana's Interagency Council on Drugs and the coordination between 92 county coalitions.

Mr. Neil Moore discussed the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute and its function in serving as the planning component to guide state strategies for addressing substance abuse. He noted the history of the Commission and its function in coordinating local strategies and providing input to the Governor on policy. Mr. Moore reviewed the Statutory Authority for the Commission and funding sources.

Ms. Sonya Cleveland described the two roles the Commission: (1) to provide a large vision of how to address substance abuse across the state and (2) to make policy recommendations on how

to best target resources and pursue braided funding opportunities.

Ms. Cleveland discussed Indiana's substance abuse structure and discussed the significant work around building capacity in local communities with sustainability as a goal. Local coordinating councils (one in each of 92 counties) focus on comprehensive community plans (strategic plans tailored to communities to identify substance abuse related issues) and work to empower communities to use data and assessment in developing strategic plan objectives and generating change. Ms. Cleveland noted that the communities develop very fluid plans in order to ensure outcomes.

Responding to Mr. Burke's question, Ms. Cleveland noted that local coordinating councils are for the most part independent and many were developed from pre-existing groups. Dr. Nelson inquired about the membership structure of the councils and Ms. Cleveland referred members to a worksheet in their packets. Ms. Cleveland noted that the Governor's Commission for a Drug-Free Indiana establishes policies and procedures and makes recommendations for best practices.

Mr. Minor asked about the funding of the local coordination councils and Ms. Cleveland responded that they are funded by offender fees at the county level (75% stays in county and 25% goes to the State for the Commission) as well as Safe and Drug Free Schools funding. This is a "payback" system, reinvesting dollars from offenders back into the community.

Local coordination councils are encouraged to seek additional resources and are encouraged to plan for sustainability. Community Consultants work with the councils, providing essential technical assistance to create strategic plans and funding is not allocated until the plans are approved. Councils are allowed the opportunity to revise and adjust strategic plans if they are not approved.

Ms. Copple added that Indiana uses a comprehensive strategy for the local coordinating councils that includes prevention, treatment and enforcement (25% for each category and the remaining 25% for administrative).

Ms. Cleveland noted that the councils embrace the SPF SIG process, combining data driven strategies with required annual benchmarks. Data collection has been a challenge.

Mr. Burke thanked the representatives for sharing their insight from Indiana's perspective.

Strategic Focus Areas for 2008

Mr. Burke introduced the different strategic focus areas and turned the floor over to Mr. Copple.

Mr. Copple noted that at the last ASAP meeting representatives from each priority areas were asked to begin reporting out on outcomes, and that each group would present on these focus areas.

Law Enforcement/Drug Trafficking

Mr. Copple referred to Ms. Karen Ziegler to report on the Law Enforcement/Drug Trafficking focus area. Ms. Ziegler recognized all members who participated in the creation and assessment of this priority area. The Outcomes Report was distributed in the member's packets at the meeting, and Ms. Ziegler presented to the group using PowerPoint.

Ms. Ziegler presented the problem areas identified within the Executive Action Briefing and elaborated on the outcomes and next steps surrounding these problems.

Problem 1: Cost benefit analysis of current funding for law enforcement.

Ms. Ziegler discussed cost benefit analysis on information sharing and she mentioned that it would not be useful to review every grant. Instead, she suggested it would be preferable to review the grants after they have been awarded.

Ms. Ziegler stated that, as far as next steps, the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission (ACJC) will compile a list of grants through the U.S. Department of Justice and will institutionalize this process as an annual report.

Problem 2: Intelligence sharing and analysis.

Ms. Ziegler noted that ASAP as a group identified a need to invite National Guard representation. Therefore, the group took immediate action to bring National Guard Representative Major Scott Hadley to the table.

Ms. Ziegler remarked that one of the action steps given for this particular problem was to review other states' strategies. In doing so, the group realized that Arizona is a model for information sharing; however, the state can improve marketing this capacity to other agencies in the state and communicating how to properly utilize the data.

Ms. Ziegler further noted that ACJC is providing "non-HIDTA" data to HIDTA; in doing so, they succeeded in reducing the data gap. This outcome came about as a result of a conversation at ASAP.

Ms. Ziegler continued and communicated that next steps include more effectively using data and identifying and addressing data gaps, and also reaching out to other intelligence systems.

Ms. Ziegler noted that the original recommendation regarding surveying law enforcement agencies (of which there are more than 400) was not feasible, so instead it would be more effective to work through each task force contact from each county to discuss intelligence sharing and partnering. She suggested consulting the intelligence sharing groups that exist throughout the state and facilitating discussions between these groups.

Problem 3: DEC Guidelines Enhanced

Mr. Anthony Coulson noted the challenge of lacking DEC protocols for children not found in meth labs but in drug fueled environments, without which law enforcement does not feel very comfortable. Mr. Copple noted that when DEC information is returned from the

Arizona Attorney General's office it might be identified as a priority area. Ms. Irene Jacobs referenced the Children of Incarcerated Parents Group that is working on arrest protocols and the potential to blend the two efforts and streamline the protocols.

Mr. Coulson mentioned that there is an expected home meth lab increase due to decreased meth coming from Mexico, resulting from Mexico's ban on pseudoephedrine.

Ms. Angie Rodgers noted the upcoming Governor's Children's Cabinet meeting involving members from Child Protective Services (CPS), law enforcement, child advocacy centers, among others, that would discuss the recently passed House bills on Child Protective Services. She mentioned that she could include the DEC matter as an agenda item.

Problem 4: US-Mexico Border and illicit drug traffic

Ms. Ziegler said the group would seek out the existing studies addressing this topic. DEA will look to get information from the US Border Patrol.

Problem 5: Coordination and Communication with Tribes

Ms. Ziegler offered some examples of coordination with the Tribes, such as the Four Corners Meth Summit and the work between ACJC and HIDTA and the Colorado River Indian Tribes. Still, challenges exist with regards to legal documentation and issues of sovereignty.

Ms. Ziegler stated that the next steps for this addressing this problem involved the ACJC statistical center. ACJC received a grant to work with the US Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to get crime data to analyze and send back to the Tribes, and are waiting to hear on this award. Mr. Phillip Stevenson noted that Arizona will be notified in August.

Mr. Copple commended the action steps with timelines and benchmarks. He challenged the recommendation against conducting a cost benefit analysis, communicating that it may be important enough despite costs involved. Ms. Ziegler replied that after the funding analysis was conducted the group would be able to make a more accurate assessment.

Data Driven Decisions and Policy Development

Mr. Stevenson introduced this strategic focus area and the progress being made by the Epidemiology Work Group. He provided a PowerPoint presentation, and an Outcome Report which was included in the member's packets.

Problem 1: Fragmented data collection silos

Mr. Stevenson noted the problem of fragmented of data collection silos around areas of substance use and abuse. He said that action has been taken to address this issue in the Epidemiology Work Group and to identify specific agency roles and responsibilities.

Mr. Stevenson said that the Group will be producing *The Impact of Substance Abuse: A Snapshot of Arizona, 2008*. The "2008 Snapshot" will update the 2007 Report and will discuss emerging substance abuse issues, including youth abuse of prescription drugs. The Report will identify existing and continuing data gaps as well as provide policy

recommendations and how to implement them.

Ms. Jacobs commented on the Arizona Results report. She noted that it will be updated using ACJC Arizona Youth Survey (AYS) data and will need to further integrate substance abuse-related data with Arizona indicators by data from Arizona State University. Mr. Stevenson acknowledged the importance of Ms. Jacobs's comment.

Problem 2: Lack of sub-state estimates of substance specific use and abuse among adults not involved in state systems

Mr. Stevenson cited budgetary issues in addressing this problem. The Epidemiological Work Group will look into leveraging other resources.

Problem 3: No accurate and consistent instrument measuring capacity

Mr. Stevenson stated that the *Substance Abuse Treatment Services Capacity Report* sheds light on treatment capacity. Ms. Kathy Waters communicated that key players to include are adult and juvenile probation and corrections, to which Mr. Stevenson agreed. Dr. Kellie Warren noted that 84% of youth involved in the justice system have diagnosable abuse or dependency and that the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC) would like to be a part of these conversations and the Executive Action Briefings. She mentioned that ADJC has had to increase its capacity to serve this population.

Mr. Stevenson provided a presentation that illustrated that risk and protective factors have a clear link to prescription drug abuse in youth. There is a clear connection between the rise of accumulated risk factors and a greater likelihood of prescription drug abuse. The reverse is true with protective factors: as protective factors increase, there is a decrease in the likelihood of prescription drug abuse. Mr. Stevenson noted that this relationship has been demonstrated to be present with regards to all abused substances, not just prescription drugs. He assessed the data as positive in that they demonstrates the promise in addressing risk and protective factors, which are studied in the AYS.

Ms. Jacobs asked how many protective factors are "needed," to which Mr. Stevenson responded that this question has not been answered.

Mr. Copple referenced a RAND Corporation study from a few years ago declaring that for every \$1 spent on protective factors saves \$9 in risk factors.

In responding to Mr. Duce Minor's comment, Mr. Stevenson agreed that issue of accessibility of prescription drugs is important to address. He said that one out of every five 12th graders reported abusing prescription drugs in their lifetime.

Mr. Stevenson discussed a study conducted in Florida demonstrating the horrendous impact of prescription drug abuse and mortality rates. He noted a significant data gap in Arizona as the state does not have a Medical Examiners Association as Florida did in completing the study but instead has six different medical examiner's offices with different reporting procedures. Mr. Copple suggested that that problem may be something for Arizona to consider as it could help to more effectively inform policy. Mr. Coulson noted that it is often

a challenge in data collection, as it is not consistent.

Child Welfare and Substance Abuse

Ms. Rodgers discussed the outcomes achieved in the Child Welfare strategic focus area. An Outcomes Report with an attachment was included in the member's packets.

Problem 1: Inadequate resources and lack of documentation

Ms. Rogers referred to this problem and its effect on services within the child welfare system. She said that the Department of Economic Security (DES) and Department of Health Services (DHS) are aware of what is being provided and the funding available, yet there is limited information for analysis. They lack a means to integrate the data systems and tracking capabilities.

Ms. Rodgers reported that DES has updated its safety and risk assessment for substance abuse. This assessment is used to develop case plans to treat families.

Ms. Rogers mentioned the completed Strategic Program Area Review (SPAR) and the resources distributed around the state for substance abuse programs. She said that DHS was able to analyze where funds are going and how they can be redistributed.

Dr. Laura Nelson added that the *Substance Abuse Treatment Services Capacity Report* provided information on the availability and capacity for treatment and monitoring is now underway to ensure that services are of high quality.

Dr. Nelson stated that the providers of the Arizona Families F.I.R.S.T. program are being reviewed by an external review organization. She said that in order improve efficient spending providers are expected to screen for TXIX eligibility and refer for determination as indicated in order to seek federal money first. Contract amendments have been written directing Providers to prioritize families involved in the CPS system and to track grant dollars more closely to understand how this substance abuse money is used and to better identify gaps in the system.

Dr. Nelson shared the objectives around substance abuse for CYR '09, including the strategy to increase the number of providers that can prescribe Buprenorphine, a drug that aids individuals in opiate detoxification. In responding to Mr. Burke's question about the drug, Dr. Nelson noted that individuals do not need to be monitored daily as with methadone, nor do they need to take this medication for years. It is an excellent medication for treating addiction to prescription opioid medications.

Emerging Trends and the State's Capacity to Respond

Mr. Copple presented the final strategic focus area and referred to the Executive Action Briefing, included in the member's packets.

Problem 1: Insufficient structures and resources to monitor trends

Mr. Copple reiterated the goal to direct resources to develop drug-abuse monitoring systems to provide current data and data analysis on emerging drug and alcohol trends in the general population. He expressed appreciation for the responsiveness of the Epidemiology Work Group, and Emerging Issues Sub-committee especially with its work on prescription drug abuse.

Mr. Copple said that the Work Group is in the process of developing a monitoring system. Mr. Copple complimented the State of Arizona for the Arizona Arrestee Reporting Information Network (AARIN), operated through ASU, but noted that this system only applies to Maricopa County and a need exists to create a similar network for communities outside the county.

Problem 2: Initiatives do not reflect comprehensive or inclusive strategies

Mr. Copple stated that the goal is to enlist parents, youth, communities, consumers and policymakers in the development of evidence-based prevention strategies that can adequately respond to emerging trends to substance abuse. He then presented action steps.

Problem 3: Community coalitions lack capacity to track emerging drug trends

Mr. Copple stated that Pima Prevention Partnership (PPP), which monitors the statewide coalitions, was assessing the use of the technical assistance model to build the capacity to report on their observations about emerging trends. PPP is teaching communities how to undertake these types of assessments and to develop a mechanism to report to the state. Mr. Copple called for questions on this matter and members noted the use of risk and protective factors and building on resilience.

PIJ Process Update

Ms. Hester provided update on the Project Investment Justification (PIJ) Process. The Governor's Division for Substance Abuse Policy received budget proposals from two state agencies, DES and ACJC, for FY 2010. Ms. Hester referred ASAP members to their packets for summaries of the PIJ-SAP requests.

Ms. Karen Bulkeley provided an overview of the DES proposal for Arizona Families F.I.R.S.T., a substance abuse program for parents involved in CPS. The request was for a \$2.5 million for Families F.I.R.S.T. to expand its services. Ms. Bulkeley noted that although Families F.I.R.S.T. was not presently experiencing a wait list situation, this is only due to the creativity of providers, as providers know that resources are limited.

Ms. Bulkeley said that as a result of the Executive Order 2008-01 which prioritized CPS families for substance abuse treatment, DES is revising the Strengths and Risks Assessment process, which enables workers to identify more clearly where substance abuse is an issue. She anticipated an increase in referrals as a result of this modification.

Ms. Ziegler then provided an overview of the ACJC proposal for the Arizona Youth Survey (AYS). The request was for \$482,213 to conduct the 2010 AYS. Ms. Ziegler mentioned the sources of funding for the AYS, including a \$25,000 appropriation every other year, among other

appropriations. She acknowledged that one of the agencies that has previously provided funding for the AYS budget will be unable to follow through with its funding commitment. As a result of this funding insecurity, ACJC asked ASAP for its support for the PIJ to fund the 2010 AYS. Ms. Ziegler mentioned the importance of institutionalizing a funding stream for the survey.

Mr. Burke opened the floor for dialogue regarding the two PIJ requests, and he suggested that the group move forward on their approval of both PIJ proposals.

Mr. Burke requested that members submit any final input to Ms. Hester by close of business, on Wednesday, July 2, 2008. At that point, the PIJ recommendations will be final and move forward.

Mr. Coulson inquired as to the number of schools and students surveyed by the AYS. Ms. Ajamie and Mr. Stevenson responded, commenting that there are approximately 1,800 schools in the state. The AYS 2006 surveyed 362 schools and the AYS 2008 surveyed approximately 350 schools. Mr. Stevenson noted that approximately 60,000 students participated in 2006 survey. Mr. Stevenson mentioned that the survey provides data on local and state levels and provides data that is required to fulfill the requirements of federal and state grants throughout the state.

“Getting Ready” Program

Director Dora Schriro of the Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC) provided a presentation on the Getting Ready Program which has been recognized by the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University for innovations in government.

Dr. Schriro stated that ADC’s commitment towards reentry begins on day one of incarceration, as 19% of inmates will be released with no community supervision.

Dr. Schriro provided information on admissions and the need for separate strategies to address the needs of inmates. She noted that the ADC plan of action is to improve correctional outcomes and focus on transition six to 12 months before release. She commented that the average length of stay is 1.5 years.

Dr. Schriro discussed intake and classification. For incarceration periods averaging 29 months, ADC performs a five day assessment. For periods six months or less, a three day assessment is performed. From these assessments, ADC develops individualized corrections plans and assignments to services based on the need for intervention, risk to self and others, length of stay and amenability to treatment. She stressed that every inmate receives a correction plan and no individual has the opportunity to opt out.

Dr. Schriro addressed the 7x3x3 Pre-Release Preparations. She explained that the title refers to the intention to render pre-release preparations as similar to “real life” as possible – seven days a week, three parts to every day, and a three tiered system of earned incentives. She noted the strategy to move inmates quickly through the plan using these incentives. Dr. Schriro described administering corrections facilities as much like the real world as possible to prepare prisoners for reentry. Examples include improving wages, establishing and adhering to a disciplinary

rulebook, and delegating more responsibilities back to inmates (such as making them responsible for money management and waking up on time, among others).

Dr. Schriro detailed the typical day in pre-release as reflecting a typical day outside of incarceration. With regards to the “workday,” she said that 83% of the incarcerated population is employed on at least a part-time basis. She noted that “leisure time” is divided between time spent for structured self-improvement activities and time spent for community benefit and family reunification. Dr. Schriro commented that a good portion of this leisure time is involvement in victim-focused services such as fundraisers.

Dr. Schriro further explained transition-specific planning. She said that ADC ensures that core credentials are provided when re-entry occurs. She emphasized that is critical that prisoners learn how to make good decisions and that they can still make improvements regardless of their custody level.

Dr. Schriro presented the outcomes of the Getting Ready Program. The Program was implemented in July 2003, and since that time the incarcerated population has increased 17%. She said that the outcomes have outperformed traditional correctional interventions. She noted a decrease in institutional violence: drops in inmate assaults (37% decline), staff assaults (51% decline), suicides (33% decline) and sexual assaults (70% decline). Furthermore, the Program has contributed to 35% fewer arrests and 5% less revocation among those former inmates who participated in the Program and had been released for two years, versus comparable former inmates. Inmate grievances and medical grievances fell 17% and 20%, respectively. Dr. Schriro also stated that ADC inmates earned more than 27% of all GEDs awarded in the state. Today, 74% of inmates have achieved high school equivalent education and completed job-training programs. Finally, ADC inmates raised \$1.4 million for Arizona crime victims’ agencies over the past four years.

Dr. Schriro remarked that the ADC system-wide reform and associated outcomes were based solely on efficiency reviews and were done without new money or enabling legislation.

Dr. Schriro then discussed a hot spot analysis which identified six zip codes in the state to which most released ADC felons return. She said that the Department was previously focused on individual offenders; however, inmates were not distributed equally throughout state. She described the issue of stabilizing the offenders returning to the neighborhoods and stabilizing the neighborhoods themselves. ADC uses geographic mapping to locate these communities. She said that ADC also mapped the resources within each identified community.

Dr. Schriro briefly highlighted short- and long-term outcomes noting that two-thirds of released inmates remain successfully in the neighborhood. She said re-entry procedures were conducted in a conscious, collective way by meeting with families to discuss available resources and determining how to accelerate connecting with AHCCCS and other agencies providing necessary services. These procedures encouraged neighborhood stabilization.

Dr. Schriro responded to a question by Ms. Cleveland stating that that the definition of “new crime” in Arizona is one committed within 3 years of release. Dr. Schriro noted that ADC has

had accomplishments despite geographic challenges, and she observed that an improved network of host communities has been developed with local and state partners. Additionally, the Department has facilitated connections with faith-based resources upon individuals' re-entry.

Dr. Schriro commented that ADC has cultivated relationships statewide with organizations and domestic violence shelters representing efforts addressing victims' issues to develop more effective plans. She stated that the Workforce Advisory Group was helpful in this regard, and cited the relationship with the Homebuilders' Association as a relevant example. She characterized it as a richly woven fabric to deal with each facet.

Mr. Burke referred members to their packets for further information and an article on the hot spot zip codes published in the *Arizona Republic*, dated 15 June, 2008.

Committee Updates

Ms. Hester referred members to their packets to review a one-page sheet on committee outcomes as of June 2008.

Other Items and Upcoming Events

Dr. Kim O'Connor noted the recent federal site visits for the Access to Recovery grant and the need for the full support of the Administrative Office of the Courts to implement the program quickly within the drug court system.

Dr. O'Connor referred members to the briefing documents in their packets on the following issues: the Federal Second Chance Act of 2007; behavioral health services for released offenders; and the new Screening and Brief Intervention eligibility codes for Medicaid services and the costs and benefits associated with implementing them.

Mr. Burke commended ADC, remarking that of over 1,000 applicants for the Harvard award, Arizona's "Getting Ready" program was 1 of 15 selected.

Future Meeting Schedule

Mr. Burke announced that the next ASAP meeting would be held on July 23, 2008 from 1:00-3:00 pm.

Call to the Public

Mr. Burke made a call to the public and there was no response.

Adjourn

Mr. Burke noted the impact of the tight state FY 2009 budget, especially around substance abuse related issues, and thanked the agencies for their dedication and hard work on ASAP.

Mr. Burke adjourned the meeting at 3:15 pm.